

VZCZCXYZ0002  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0245/01 0591744  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O R 281744Z FEB 10  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0673  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0421  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0491  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0495  
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0491

S E C R E T GENEVA 000245

SIPDIS  
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/28  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#)  
SUBJECT: SFO-GVA-VIII: (U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING GROUP  
MEETING, FEBRUARY 24, 2010

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose E. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department  
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

[1](#)1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VIII-080.

[1](#)2. (U) Meeting Date: February 24, 2010

Time: 10:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.

Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

[1](#)3. (S) During a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Working Group  
meeting held at the U.S. Mission on February 24, the sides  
discussed Part Four to the Annex on Inspection Activities,  
specifically, the provisions and requirements for site diagrams and  
references to Part Two of the Protocol. End summary.

[1](#)4. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Site Diagrams; and Part Two of the  
Protocol.

-----  
SITE DIAGRAMS

-----

15. (S) Mr. Trout asked General Orlov about his intent to return to Moscow the weekend of February 27. Orlov, in a departure from the Russian delegation's recent talking points, admitted that he would not know whether the Russians would be returning to Moscow until later in the afternoon when Russian Head of Delegation, Ambassador Antonov, returned from his Moscow trip.

16. (S) Continuing the work begun the previous day, Orlov suggested to Trout that the group begin with the last section of paragraph 1 of Part Four to the Annex on Inspection Activities. Colonel Petrov made a brief intervention, suggesting that since the group had worked from the U.S. proposal yesterday, the group should logically work from the Russian proposal today. Orlov stated that Petrov's proposal made no sense and that the group should continue to work from a single proposal, and in this case it would be the U.S. proposal. LT Lobner offered that since the Russian side had already pointed out some errors in the Joint Draft Text (JDT), perhaps, as the two sides continued their discussions, Petrov could point out missing text.

17. (S) Trout deleted U.S.-proposed text at the bottom of subparagraph 1(a) that dealt with provisions for simplified site

diagrams and moved the concept into the chapeau for paragraph 2. Continuing to subparagraph 1(b), a concern arose about the Russian translation for SLBM storage area. After an exhaustive discussion of English and Russian phraseology, it was agreed to use "area at a submarine base at which non-deployed SLBMs are stored." Much of the remaining time in the session was dedicated to this terminology and emplacing it in subparagraph 1(b) in all places where "SLBM storage area" had previously resided.

18. (S) Discussion transitioned to subparagraph 1(c). Trout and Orlov discussed the issue of whether "deployed heavy bombers" or just "heavy bombers" should be depicted on site diagrams for air bases. Orlov asked Trout to delete "deployed," while Trout promised to consult with his colleagues and return with an answer as soon as he could.

19. (S) The Russian side dropped portions of its bracketed text in subparagraphs 1(c), 1(d)(i), and 1(d)(ii). Work on this section came to a halt when the sides began to discuss the stipulation of areas of "ten square kilometers" for special provisions. The sides agreed to postpone the discussion until after this issue had been resolved in other working groups which dealt with basing areas and test ranges.

110. (S) Moving to paragraph 2, another point of contention arose when Orlov asked Trout what the United States considered to be absolutely necessary vocabulary in English to equate to the Russian words for site diagram. The words "site diagram," Orlov explained, were used in this section as general terminology while outlining requirements which should be on simplified site diagrams, annotated site diagrams, and coastlines and waters diagrams. Trout explained that the United States would insist that the requirements for each type of site diagram be spelled out, as there was no equivalent English word that encompassed all three types of diagrams. Lobner stated that the United States would have to take paragraph 2 and re-work some of the text to incorporate this concept.

¶11. (S) Petrov continued discussion on the first subparagraphs of paragraph 2, but Trout suggested enough work on the Annex had been accomplished for that day's meeting, explaining that he wanted to use some of the time remaining to discuss a few topics in Part Two of the Protocol. Orlov agreed.

-----  
PART TWO OF THE PROTOCOL  
-----

¶12. (S) Trout and Orlov returned to discussing the purpose of Part Two of the Protocol. The Russian side, Orlov explained, saw Part Two as the source for many of the requirements throughout paragraph 1 of Part Four of the Annex on Inspection Activities. He further

opined that Part Two was authoritative, since it was signed by presidents, and was appropriately labeled "the Database" at the behest of the United States. Orlov closed his oration by stating he had no idea why the United States wanted to label Part Two "The Database" if it did not consider Part Two to be referred to throughout the treaty as a source for specific data, in this case the facilities for which site diagrams are required.

¶13. (S) Trout responded by repeating the same logic he relayed to Orlov the day prior: Part Two contained only the categories of data which would later be used to organize the data populated in the electronic database. Part Two, however, did not list specific facilities nor would specific data ever appear in the text. This data would be contained in the electronic database, so the electronic database should rightly be referred to throughout Part Four to the Annex on Inspection Activities. Orlov responded by saying the sides should then agree to call Part Two to the Protocol "Categories of the Database on Strategic Offensive Arms," or something similar. Trout promised to discuss the issue with his colleagues, but agreed that Orlov's proposed title was a more accurate title for Part Two.

¶14. (U) Documents provided: None.

¶15. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Trout

Mr. Brown

LTC Litterini (RO)

LT Lobner

Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA

Gen Orlov

Col Petrov

Mr. Pischulov

Ms. Evarovskaya (Int)

¶16. (U) Gottemoeller sends.  
KING